

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/645,016	08/21/2003	Petri Lahdesmaki	04770.00135	6227	
22908 BANNER & W	7590 12/29/2006 ITCOFF L.TD		EXAMINER		
	VACKER DRIVE	SAX, STEVEN PAUL			
SUITE 3000 CHICAGO, IL	60606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Cincado, il	00000		2174		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MOI	NTHS	12/29/2006	PAP	ER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary		Α	pplication No.	Applican	Applicant(s)	
		1	0/645,016	LAHDES	LAHDESMAKI	
		E	xaminer	Art Unit		
			teven P. Sax	2174		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic r Reply	cation appear	rs on the cover she	et with the correspond	dence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on .				
_	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2		tion is non-final.			
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				as to the merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the ap	oplication.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ion and/or el	ection requirement			
Applicati	on Papers					
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepte	ed or b)⊡ objected	to by the Examiner.	,	
	Applicant may not request that any object	tion to the drav	wing(s) be held in ab	eyance. See 37 CFR 1	l.85(a).	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	the correction	is required if the draw	wing(s) is objected to. S	See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11) 🔲	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Exam	iner. Note the attac	ched Office Action or	form PTO-152.	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
<ul> <li>2)</li></ul>						

**Art Unit: 2174** 

## **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. This application has been examined.
- 2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/442487. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because note the correspondence below:

Application/Control Number: 10/645,016

Art Unit: 2174

present application	'487 application
•	
claims 1, 20	claim 8
claim 2	claims 2 and 9,
	these form the buffer
claim 3	claim 20
claim 4	claims 9, 18
claims 5, 6	claims 6, 7
claim 7	claims 12, 13
claim 8, 9	claims 13, 19,
	these suggest the adjustability
claim 10	claim 6
claims 11-13	claim 6, 16
	this would either part is not present
claim 14	claim 10
claim 15	claim 10
claim 16	claim 11
claim 17	claim 12
claim 18	claim 5
Claim 19	claim 9

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P. Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

STEVEN SAX STEVEN SAX STEVEN SAX

\*\*